

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 9 has been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. No new matter has been added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to claim 9 can be found in paragraph 61 of the specification.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 6 and 13 are allowable.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,626,410 (hereinafter "Chambers"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the Patent Office, Chambers allegedly teaches a transmissive screen applied to a rear projector comprising fiber optics and a light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing device to make the angular distribution of the light exiting from the light guide spaces uniform over the transmissive screen. The Patent Office further equates the light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing device as recited in claim 1 with output diffusing screen (42) of Chambers. Applicant disagrees with both.

The output diffusion screen (42) of Chambers is not equivalent to the light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing device as recited in claim 1, but is instead more analogous to the light diffusing layer (see claim 9). Chambers discloses that each captured light ray is reflected a different number of times inside the fiber optic array, so that the rays exit the fiber array with a propagation direction that are substantially randomized. The light rays are then diffused by the output diffusing screen (42) to produce a brighter image. See column 4, lines 5-21 of Chambers. Chambers does not teach or suggest a transmissive screen including a

light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing means such that the light exiting the light guide plate is uniformly distributed over the transmissive screen.

The purpose of the light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing device is not to make the image brighter, but is instead to make the exiting light effectively uniform over the central and the peripheral regions of the transmissive screen so that a rear projector with a wide viewing angle is achieved. See paragraph 54 of the specification. The light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing device is not for brightening the image like the output diffusing screen (42) of Chambers.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Chambers does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1-9. In particular, Chambers does not teach or suggest a transmissive screen including a light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing means such that the light exiting the light guide plate is uniformly distributed over the transmissive screen as recited in claim 1.

Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Claims 2-4

Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chambers in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,743,090 (hereinafter "Reidinger"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Reidinger does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Chambers as discussed above. In particular, Reidinger also does not teach or suggest a transmissive screen including a light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing means such that the light exiting the light guide plate is uniformly distributed over the transmissive screen as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend on allowable claim 1, and are thus also allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Claims 5, 7, 8 and 14

Claims 5, 7, 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chambers in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,083 (hereinafter "Goldenberg"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Goldenberg does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Chambers as discussed above. In particular, Goldenberg also does not teach or suggest a transmissive screen including a light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing means such that the light exiting the light guide plate is uniformly distributed over the transmissive screen as recited in claim 1.

Claims 5, 7, 8 and 14 depend, directly or indirectly, on allowable claim 1, and are thus also allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Claim 12

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chambers in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0028370 (hereinafter "Bourdelaïs"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bourdelaïs does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Chambers discussed above. In particular, Bourdelaïs does not teach or suggest a transmissive screen including a light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing means such that the light exiting the light guide plate is uniformly distributed over the transmissive screen as recited in claim 1.

Claim 12 indirectly depends on allowable claim 1, and is thus also allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

D. Claim 15

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chambers in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,637,888 (hereinafter "Haven"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Haven does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Chambers discussed above. In particular, Haven does not teach or suggest a transmissive screen including a light-exit-angle distribution uniformizing means such that the light exiting the light guide plate is uniformly distributed over the transmissive screen as recited in claim 1.

Claim 15 depends on allowable claim 1, and is thus also allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Leana Levin

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin
Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/hs

Date: November 24, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--